

Appl. No. 10/625,306  
Amdt. Dated September 8, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2005

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office action mailed June 28, 2005. Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Claims 1-22 remain pending in this application, with Claims 1, 8, and 15 being the independent claims. No claims have been amended, canceled, or withdrawn, and no new matter has been added.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as allegedly being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,928,682 (Stevenson et al.). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 1 and 8 relate to a method of controlling aircraft cabin altitude in an aircraft that is certified to fly to a maximum certified altitude, and has at least a maximum cabin-to-atmosphere differential pressure limit, when the aircraft exceeds its maximum certified flight altitude. Each of these claims recites, *inter alia*, the steps of: (i) determining that the aircraft has exceeded the maximum certified altitude; and (ii) automatically controlling cabin altitude based at least in part on aircraft altitude, such that the maximum cabin-to-atmosphere differential pressure limit is not exceeded.

Independent Claim 15 relates to an aircraft cabin pressure control system for an aircraft having at least a nominal cabin-to-atmosphere differential pressure limit and a maximum cabin-to-atmosphere differential pressure limit, and that includes a controller that supplies valve commands and an outflow valve coupled to receive the valve command signals and selectively move between an open and a closed position. Independent Claim 15 recites, *inter alia*, the supplied valve command signals selectively move the outflow valve between the open and closed positions to thereby control aircraft cabin altitude, such that: (i) the nominal cabin-to-atmosphere differential pressure limit is not exceeded when the signal representative of aircraft altitude indicates aircraft altitude is at or below the maximum certified altitude, and (ii) the maximum cabin-to-atmosphere differential pressure limit is not exceeded when the signal representative of aircraft

Appl. No. 10/625,306  
 Amdt. Dated September 8, 2005  
 Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2005

altitude indicates aircraft altitude exceeds the maximum certified altitude by a first predetermined magnitude.

Stevenson et al. relates to an on-board oxygen generating system for an aircraft that includes a molecular sieve oxygen generating system (MSOGS) and a breathable gas delivery regulator. The breathable gas delivery regulator can selectively deliver 100% MSOGS output gas or air-diluted gas to a user. When air-diluted gas delivery is selected, a portion of the 100% MSOG output gas is diverted to charge a storage plenum, and when 100% MSOG gas delivery is selected no MSOG gas is diverted to the storage plenum. There is nothing in Stevenson et al. that even remotely teaches or suggests a system or method for controlling aircraft cabin altitude.

Hence, it is submitted that Stevenson et al. fails to disclose, or even remotely suggest, at least the above-noted features of independent Claims 1, 8, and 15. Namely, Stevenson et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least the method steps of determining that the aircraft has exceeded the maximum certified altitude, and automatically controlling cabin altitude based at least in part on aircraft altitude, such that the maximum cabin-to-atmosphere differential pressure limit is not exceeded, as recited in independent Claims 1 and 8. Moreover, Stevenson et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least a controller that supplies valve command signals that selectively move the outflow valve between the open and closed positions to thereby control aircraft cabin altitude, such that: (i) the nominal cabin-to-atmosphere differential pressure limit is not exceeded when the signal representative of aircraft altitude indicates aircraft altitude is at or below the maximum certified altitude, and (ii) the maximum cabin-to-atmosphere differential pressure limit is not exceeded when the signal representative of aircraft altitude indicates aircraft altitude exceeds the maximum certified altitude by a first predetermined magnitude, as recited in independent Claim 15.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102 rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants further note that all of the other art cited by the Examiner has been reviewed and also fails to disclose at least the above-noted features of independent Claims 1, 8, and 15. Indeed, none discloses a system and method that control aircraft

Appl. No. 10/625,306  
Amdt. Dated September 8, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2005

cabin altitude based on a determination as to whether the maximum certified altitude has been exceeded.

Conclusion

Based on the above, independent Claims 1, 8, and 15 are patentable over the citations of record. The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to the independent claims and because each recite features which are patentable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

The other art of record is also not understood to disclose or suggest the inventive concept of the present invention as defined by the claims.

Hence, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: 9/8/05

By: 

Paul D. Amrozowicz  
Reg. No. 45,264  
(480) 385-5060